

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing, reconsideration of the restriction requirement and examination of all of the claims are requested in light of the remarks which follow.

Claim 22 has been amended to be consistent with paragraph [0097] of the specification as originally filed. New Claim 32 is also consistent with that paragraph.

In response to the restriction requirement, applicants hereby elect, with traverse, Group VI, Claim 27, drawn to a regime or regimen for promoting desquamation and/or hydration of the skin and/or cell renewal in the skin and/or cell proliferation and/or differentiation in the skin of an individual in need of such treatment. New Claim 32 is also drawn to a regime or regimen for promoting desquamation and/or hydration of the skin and/or cell renewal in the skin and/or cell proliferation and/or differentiation in the skin of an individual in need of such treatment. Thus, it is believed that new Claim 32 falls in elected Group VI and should be examined together with Claim 27.

The restriction requirement is traversed for reasons set forth below.

The original wording of Claim 22 contained errors which rendered it inconsistent with the specification and which have been corrected hereinabove. It is clear from the corrected wording of Claim 22 that the regime or regimen of Claim 22 is very closely related to the regime or regimen of elected Group VI, Claim 27, since dry skin and other skin disorders linked to desquamation may be understood as lack of desquamation. Claim 23 has been grouped with Claim 22. Further, the conditions enumerated in Claim 24 are skin disorders related to lack of desquamation. All of Claims 22, 23, 24 (Group II and III) are indicated by the Examiner as being classified in class 424, subclass 94.63; elected Group VI, Claim 27, is classified identically, as

are the composition claims Claims 1-21 (Group I), and regime/regimen Claim 25 (Group IV), Claim 28 (Group VII), and Claim 29 (Group IX). Thus, it is not seen that it would be burdensome for the Examiner to examine these related groups of claims together. As to Claim 26, Group V, although the classification appears to be different, atopic dermatitis is also related to the elected regime/regimen of Claim 27, as this is a disorder of the barrier function of the skin in which the stratum corneum is damaged and moisture is lost; thus, the promotion of desquamation and hydrating of the skin provided by the regime/regimen of elected Group VI/Claim 27, are closely related to the Claim 26/Group V regime/regimen for treating atopic dermatitis. Moreover, the compositions of Group I, Claims 1-21, and the packages of Group IX, Claims 30-31, are uniquely well suited from carrying out the regimes/regimens of the invention, including the regimes/regimens of elected Group VI/Claim 27. Therefore they are appropriate for consideration together with the elected Group VI.

Thus, the restriction requirement is traversed in its entirety. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement and examination of all of Claims 1-32 on the merits are believed to be in order and are earnestly solicited.

The Examiner has indicated that if applicants elect Group I or Group III, an election of a single disclosed species is required. However, applicants have elected Group VI; therefore, no election of species is believed to be required.

In the event that the Examiner agrees to examine non-elected Group III/Claim 24 together with elected Group VI and therefore requires an election of a single disclosed species of Group III, applicants elect, with traverse, xerosis. In the event that the Examiner agrees to examine non-elected Group I/Claims 1-21 together with elected Group VI and therefore requires an election of a single disclosed species

from the additional ingredients recited in Claim 17, applicants elect, with traverse, cinnamic acid. However, the election of species requirements are traversed because election of species normally presupposes that no generic claim is allowable and no art has been adduced which would militate against allowance of a generic claim herein. Withdrawal of the election of species requirements are believed to be in order and are earnestly solicited.

It is requested that the Examiner acknowledge applicants' claims for domestic and foreign priority and the certified copy of the French priority document which has been filed herein.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: February 23, 2005

By: Mary Katherine Baumeister
Mary Katherine Baumeister
Registration No. 26,254

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620